

no no

is

turn
inter
amon

he is
La F

of A
pouv
gram

N

tra
De
ye
fra
in
Co
en
pu
H
Q

Doc No 21580 pamphlets 36 859

Sir Charles Tupper.---"Laurier is too British for me."

SIR CHARLES TUPPER'S WORDS.—Immediately on his return from Great Britain, Aug. 18th, 1900, Sir Charles Tupper, in an interview at Quebec with a correspondent of La Presse, Montreal, among other things said :

"In so far as Sir Wilfrid Laurier is concerned you can say that he is too British for me with his programme of Imperial Federation." La Presse, Montreal, Aug. 18, 1900.

The following is the original as printed in La Presse in its issue of Aug. 18, 1900 :

"Sir Charles—" Pour ce qui s'agit de Sir Wilfrid Laurier, vous pouvez dire en effet qu'il est trop Angalais pour moi, avec son programme de federation imperiale."

Notorious Tory Pamphlet No. 6

The succeeding pages contain a word for word translation of a Tory pamphlet in French, marked 6. During the session of the House of Commons for the year 1900, thousands of copies of this pamphlet were franked free through the mails to the French speaking electors in the province of Quebec, the franks of Conservative members being used by the clerks in the employ of the Conservative organization for this purpose. One of the franks so used was that of J. H. G. Bergeron, M. P., who is being boomed as the Quebec Conservative leader.

Sir

Th

6

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

Laurier approves of it,
Tupper condemns it.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier declares that we will take
part in other British Wars if needed.

Manitoba School Question.

The Conservative leaders and the French Cana-
dians, Sir Charles Tupper and the
Hon. Mr. Foster.



UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1907-1908

MAJOR SCHOOL

1907-1908

MAJOR SCHOOL

1907-1908

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

Sir W. Laurier offers his soldiers to England at the Jubilee festivals in 1897.

In every one of his speeches he advocates the Political Federation of the Empire.

Sir Charles Tupper opposes this idea and asks for Commercial Federation.

Where would Political Federation lead us to ?
Chamberlain's opinion.

Object of the United Empire League.

IMPERIALISM.

The first utterances of Imperialism were made in London, by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Then it was that he put the Canadian soldiers at the service of the English.

Canada to do honor to the Prime Minister had sent to England the very cream of the troops to act as a body-guard. A splendid detachment of Mounted Police, a battalion composed of the elite of our militia, were sent to London and aroused the enthusiasm of the old metropolis. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, dazzled by the applause of which he was the object, then committed the fatal mistake to give vent to words which were binding us to the war destinies of Great Britain.

Then and there was sealed the pact now stained with Canadian blood which flowed at Paardesberg, Belmont, Mafeking, Faber Farm, and in many other encounters.

On the 18th of June, 1897, at a banquet held at the Imperial Institute, after a military review before Lord Lansdowne, Secretary of War, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in a moment of enthusiasm, put all the Canadian troops at the disposal of the Empire. As a worthy descendant of French blood, he chose the anniversary of Waterloo to make the offer. According to a cablegram dated London, June 18th, 1897, to the Globe, on Lord Lansdowne, asking if, in case of just conflicts, the colonies would be willing to help England, and Sir Wilfrid is said to have replied as follows :

"Lord Lansdowne has mentioned that a day may come when the Empire might be threatened. This date, anniversary of the battle of Waterloo, reminds us that at all times England has proved itself able to win its own wars, but should a day

"come when it should be in danger, then let the bugle blow and rallying fires be lighted on the hills and in the colonies, and though we may not be able to do very much, we shall give all the help within our means."

This was a solemn promise and it was kept. A few days afterwards Sir Louis Davies even went further than his leader and pointing to the Canadian troops said in the presence of the other colonial Ministers:

"If England needs ten thousand men of this type, Canada shall give them."

As compliment to this promise, as engagement even more binding, Sir Wilfrid Laurier appointed himself in England apostle of the political union of the Empire or the Imperial Federation. All the speeches which he delivered point to this.

SIR WILFRID IMPERIALIST—POLITICAL FEDERATION ADVOCATED BY W. LAURIER.

Mr. Laurier, in London, June 12th, 1897:

"We have in our midst to-day the traveller from New Zealand. He is here, not to contemplate with astonishment the scene of ruin and desolation, but to see for himself the living embodiment of British power in an expansion never dreamt of, even in the imagination of a Macaulay. And the time will come when an inhabitant of New Zealand will stand at the gates of Westminster Palace, with a request to admit New Zealand in this historical hall, cradle of freedom."

MR. LAURIER ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS OF A REPORTER OF THE CHRONICLE, JUNE 15TH, 1897:

"More than this, Mr. Laurier, it has been said that you had stated that, were you twenty years younger, you might hope to live long enough to find, as representative of Canada, a seat in the midst of a parliament truly Imperial."

"What I said was, that were I twenty years younger I would have that ambition—and I certainly would have it."

"And what would your French-Canadian countrymen think of this?"

"They would be proud to be represented in an Imperial Parliament."

MR. LAURIER ANSWERING TO THE TOAST OF THE EMPIRE AT THE CECIL HOTEL BANQUET, JULY 1897:

"Mr. Chamberlain, he said, has approached a subject which more than any other occupies the attention of the Empire. By its nature, this subject naturally presents itself to the mind of the thinker. One thing is certain, the colonies will either have to cling closer to the Empire or to sever their connection with it. The decision to be taken, the choice to be made do not concern the colonies as much as it does the Fatherland. When Canada shall have grown sufficiently nothing shall satisfy its aspirations short of a representation in the Imperial Parliament. If this be a dream, let it be a dream cherished by both men and women."

AT THE COLONIAL INSTITUTE, JULY 2ND, 1897.

REPORT OF THE GLOBE, JULY 5TH.

"He (Sir W. Laurier) admits that the summum of his aspirations would be to see Canadians of French descent sitting at Westminster."

AT THE RECEPTION OF THE COLONIAL PARTY, JULY 5TH, 1897.

REPORT OF THE GLOBE, JULY 5TH, 1897.

"Sir W. Laurier insisted on the direct representation of the colonies in the Imperial Parliament, which, he says, should be a National Grand Council, or a Federal Imperial Parliament."

There can be no doubt as to the meaning of Sir W. Laurier's words, who wanted to swamp us in an Imperial Parliament. And nobody mistook the meaning, not even his friends.

HOW SIR W. LAURIER'S WORDS WERE INTERPRETED IN 1897. GOLDWIN SMITH'S OPINION.

"A month ago, everybody would have asserted that M. Laurier was opposed to Imperial Federation. It

seemed to be the tendency of his policy; it was the impression of all those who had approached him, and his adversaries had the habit to reproach him with being disloyal to the Empire. After a fortnight spent on the English soil, with its dinners, its ovations, its fascinations, behold the change. Mr. Laurier forsook longingly the time when Canada shall be represented in the Imperial Parliament, and he swears that were he younger, to obtain a seat as such, would be his great wish, the summum of his ambition, and that it would be a glory such as Canada is unable to offer.

"That which happened to Sir W. Laurier would be sure to happen to others. The Canadian delegates sent to the Imperial Parliament under an Imperial Federation would fall entirely under the influence of London society and would cease to be the faithful representatives of colonial interests. The result would be serious disappointments, a struggle to get rid of federation, and perhaps quarrel with the Fatherland, instead of the closer union which should be the object of federalists."

THE ORANGE SENTINEL, ORGAN OF THE ORANGEMEN, SANG THE PRAISES OF SIR W. LAURIER, BECAUSE IMPERIALIST.

OPINION OF THE ORANGE SENTINEL.

"As firm believers in Imperial Federation, we hail with pleasure the conversion of the Prime Minister and his party to our views, we scarcely hope that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's declarations will make on the English public in general, an impression as deep and favorable as that which it has made on those who have heard them. The Queen's Jubilee has brought within measurable reach the Imperial Federation which we will see to be an accomplished fact within a few years.—Orange Sentinel, July 5th, 1897."

THE GLOBE'S OPINION.

Lastly the Globe, chief organ of the Liberal party in Canada, had the following title heading in its number of July 6th, 1897 :

"Sir Wilfrid Laurier advocates colon-

ial representation in the Imperial Parliament."

On his return to Canada, Sir W. to put the idea of Imperial Federation, the accomplishment of which was his supreme object, and on March 13th, 1900, he said in the House, on the Bourassa motion :

If we were to be compelled to take part in all the wars of Great Britain I have no hesitation in saying that I agree with my hon. friend that, sharing the burden, we should also share the responsibility.

Under that condition of things which does not exist, we should have the right to say to Great Britain : If you want us to help you, call us to your councils; if you want us to take part in wars, let us share not only the burdens, but the responsibilities and duties as well. But there is no occasion to examine this contingency this day."

To realize what would mean this project of representation at Westminster, it is sufficient to read the speech delivered by Joseph Chamberlain, in the House of Commons, in April, 1900.

Mr. Chamberlain is the man whom Sir W. Laurier wanted to court when he proposed his plan of Political Federation.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S OPINION ON THE IMPERIAL FEDERATION AS PROPOSED BY SIR W. LAURIER.

The resolution as proposed to the House of Commons, was as follows :

"In the opinion of the House it is to be wished, in the interest of the Empire, that the colonies be admitted to a representation in the Imperial Parliament."

On this subject Mr. Chamberlain speaks as follows :

"Until now, apart from opinions, emitted individually by statesmen, or by societies, no step has been taken, no proposition or suggestion made, or request presented by the authorities duly authorized, by the colonies to effect the change contained in the resolution. I do not necessarily conclude that such a change would be unpopular among the colonies. . .

We can assure the colonies that we will follow them as far as they care to advance towards Imperial unity. (Applause.) But in view of the extraordinary complexity of the situation, I do not believe that the time

has come to make any suggestion as to what form will take, before many years, the realization of the Imperial unity.

Lastly we come to the famous axiom: "No taxation without representation," a question, which, in my idea, invites us to discuss no longer and which the hon. member has merely touched upon. I do not approve of what the hon. member has said as to the contrary of the adage, not being true, and that there cannot be representation without taxation.

Although the honorable members of the Opposition would not say so, I am convinced that the colonials will conclude from their proposition, that we wish to impose a tax on the colonies. (Hear, hear.)

This objection should not come from ourselves, but from the colonists themselves, who would fear our intention of imposing a taxation in exchange of a representation in Parliament where for several years longer they would only constitute a minority. (Applause.) It would then be eminently dangerous, were it known abroad, irrespective of the party to which we belong—that we give the slightest sign of an approbation to this proposition. (Applause.) I have tried to demonstrate what my reasons are, which lead me to believe the step taken by the honorable member to be premature, that it is necessarily academic, that it is disastrous."

SIR CHARLES TUPPER AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

In the meantime what was Sir Charles Tupper doing while Sir W. Laurier was thus advocating Imperial Federation?

He protested without losing a moment. In an interview with a Daily News reporter, on June 25th, 1897, he emphatically condemned this project, which Mr. Chamberlain declared since to be eminently dangerous.

"I have no faith in the idea fostered here by Sir W. Laurier, of the establishment of a great Imperial Parliament. It is a plan bound to be a failure. A few years ago the Imperial Federation League, which comprised such men as Lord Rosebery, the Marquis of Ripon, the Hon. Philippe Stanhope, the Right Hon. W. H. Smith, and several others, studied the question from all its sides, with the exception of one member only, we un-

animously decided that the idea of an Imperial Parliament was out of the question in practical politics, and Lord Rosebery was the echo of our deliberations at a meeting in the Mansion House. There are two strong reasons against such an Imperial Parliament:

Firstly, such an assembly should be invested to impose taxation for Imperial purposes, and consequently representation should be based in a certain measure on population. This would mean that in a few years England's voice would be completely drowned by that of the more populous colonies. England shall never submit to this.

Secondly, the colonies would never consent to renounce their authority and put a great proportion of their power in the hands of an assembly distant three thousand miles or more."

Q. Should we then remain as we are?

Ans. My view is that which was formulated by the Ottawa conference and this has been further endorsed by Mr. Chamberlain in his speech before the Board of Trade. Let there be preferential commercial treaty within the limits of the Empire by fostering trade with its colonies."

Such is the stand taken by Sir Charles Tupper, and from which he has never deviated.

Moreover, it is the stand he had taken long before, when the Imperial Federation League wanted to make in Canada a move to participate in the Territorial and Maritime defence of the Empire.

Sir Charles Tupper had refused to lend himself to that movement in spite of all the disagreements which might have been caused him because of this hostile attitude. The proof is found in the following:

SIR CHARLES TUPPER IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY FOR OCTOBER, 1892, DECLARED THAT CANADA IS SUFFICIENTLY CONTRIBUTING TO THE DEFENCE OF THE EMPIRE AND NEEDS NOT TO DO ANY MORE.

"And now comes the next question, that of defence. No one can fail to see how advantageous it would be for England to appear before the world with the knowledge, on the part of every foreign country, that

she is not standing alone, but acting with the united influence and support of these great British Dominions which, at a distant day, will have a population larger than that of Great Britain. The moral weight and the prestige thus given would be considerable, but the means of concerting united action for the defence between those outlying portions of the Empire and the Government of the day here, would be the most effective and practical method by which they could aid and support each other.

"Many persons, I am aware, both in the colonies and here, have looked upon the question of the defence of the Empire as best promoted and secured by a direct contribution to the support of the army and navy of this country. That I regard as a very mistaken opinion, and I believe that there is a much more effective means of promoting the object in view. In my opinion, no contribution to the army and navy of England on the part of Canada would have contributed to the defence of the Empire in a greater degree than the mode in which the public money in Canada has been expended for that purpose. We have expended, in addition to enormous grants of land, over a million pounds sterling per annum, from the first hour that we became a united country down to the present day, in constructing a great Imperial highway across Canada from ocean to ocean, not only furnishing the means for the expansion of trade and the development of Canada, but providing means of inter-communication at all seasons between the different parts of the country. Louis Riel and a mere handful of halfbreeds were able to terrorize the whole of the Northwest of Canada in 1870, for half a year, until the arrival of Lord Wolseley, who occupied three months in reaching that place after the spring opened. Lord Wolseley could now perform the same journey within two days. On the last occasion in which a rising occurred, in 1885, but ninety miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway remained incomplete.

In twenty-four hours 4,000 men had volunteered from every part of Canada to go at once to the Northwest, and the disturbance was quelled without calling upon this country for the slightest assistance.

We have, therefore, not only provided the means of inter-communication,

the means of carrying on our trade and business, and have also established a great imperial highway, which England might to-morrow find most essential for the maintenance of her power in the east. Not only has Canada furnished a highway across the continent, but it has brought Yokohama three weeks nearer to London than it is by the Suez Canal.

I give that as an illustration that there are other means, which, in my judgment, may contribute much more to the increasing strength and greatness of the Empire, than any contribution that could be levied upon any of the colonies."

SIR CHARLES AT THE MEETING OF THE EMPIRE LEAGUE IN MARCH, 1898, DEFENDS THE STAND HE HAD TAKEN WHEN HE REFUSED TO ADMIT THAT CANADA SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN THE EXPENSE OF THE DEFENCE OF THE EMPIRE.

"Before resuming my seat," said Sir Charles, "I want to take up a few statements made by the president, addressed to this meeting. None is more disposed than I am to do anything to ensure the adoption of measures the nature of which would be to effect a unity of the consecutive parties of the British Empire; but I believe it to be neither wise, nor in the interest which we all have in view, to say, as you did to-day, that Canada has assumed a most humiliating attitude and contrary to its duty, by declaring that it is not in a position to accept the burden of its responsibilities and its obligations on this subject. I regret that you should have alluded to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's speech. The threat underlying this recent speech is not only a flagrant injustice to Canada, but its nature will not tend to foster the object which we have in view. The question has been discussed thoroughly before the English public. An insignificant part of the Imperial Federation League, headed by Sir John Colcomb, and a young man acting as secretary, severed their connection with the association on this question. This was done on account of a proposition to the effect that colonies should consent to contribute in an important measure towards the maintaining of the Imperial navy, or else that they should retire from it. With

other members of the association, I objected to this attitude, believing that it was unwise to adopt such a policy."

The question having been once more raised, after Sir W. Laurier's statement demanding Canada's representation in the Imperial Parliament, Sir Charles Tupper re-enters the arena.

IN QUEBEC SIR CHARLES TUPPER DECLARED HIS OPPOSITION TO A POLITICAL FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE AND TO BE IN FAVOR OF A COMMERCIAL FEDERATION.—MARCH 3RD, 1900.

Before approaching the question of the preferential tariff, Sir Charles says: "A few years ago the United Empire Commercial League was formed in England. The object of its members was to study the best means to unite more closely the different parts of the Empire. I was a member of the Imperial Federation League and when I realized that the idea was that the different parts of the Empire should contribute directly towards maintaining the army and the navy, I opposed, stating that in my opinion this step would tend to disjoin the different parts of the Empire rather than unite them. Anyone wishing to know my exact view at that time will find it clearly stated in an article on the Unity of the Empire, published in the Nineteenth Century, which was discussed for some six months.

Six years later, I am still of the same opinion. I have said and I still say, that it is false to state that Canada has done nothing towards the union of the Empire. Canada has spent millions to create a national road of the Atlantic Ocean, to organize its militia, etc., and under these circumstances I felt it would be wrong to make the people contribute towards the maintenance of the army and the navy of the Empire. I upheld that our behaviour in the past should be a guarantee for the future, but that this should be left entirely to the judgment of the Canadian people.

"It has been said," adds Sir Charles, "that I am the cause of the breaking up of the league. I can say I am glad if I am."

"Sir Wilfrid Laurier pretends that

his policy is a Parliamentary Federation of the Empire."

Sir Charles then shows that this policy was much discussed by Lord Rosebery and other British politicians, who declared it to be absolutely impracticable.

"This policy means the establishment of an Imperial Parliament sitting at St. Stephens, in the centre of the Empire, and a federation based on the population.

"Each citizen would then be in the same position as if he were in England. The power of the Canadian Government to govern itself would virtually disappear. We would still have our provincial legislation, but the questions of taxation, customs, etc., would all be decided at St. Stephens.

"Being only one-half of the combined populations of England and Canada, we would necessarily have to pay half the taxes.

"Under these regulations, for the maintenance of the army and the navy, we would have to pay this year about 46 millions, which is one-quarter of the total cost of the army and navy. Such is the policy of Sir W. Laurier.

"I believe it is quite unnecessary to lose any more time on this subject.

"Any man who has a head on his shoulders will at once see that this policy means the giving up of our liberties—and our affairs administered by a permanent sitting in London."

SIR CHARLES TUPPER IN MONTREAL, APRIL 14TH, 1897, REITERATES HIS CONDEMNATION OF THE POLITICAL FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE.

(Speeches delivered before Conservative Club.)

Sir Wilfrid Laurier says that he wishes an Imperial representation, a Parliamentary Federation of the Empire, but it is an impossible thing for the present; we are not yet prepared to adopt such a policy. The greatest English statesmen who have studied carefully this matter, have declared this policy to be impracticable for the present.

Imperial Federation means that Canada would be taxed and represented according to its population. Being only one-half of the combined

population of England and Canada, we would accordingly have to pay half the taxes.

Under this regulation, for the maintenance of the army and navy, we would have to pay this year about 46 million, representing one-quarter of the total cost of the army and navy. Such is Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy.

Now for anyone to realize the fatal consequences involved by the Federation of the Empire, it is sufficient to read the following report of a meeting of the Empire League, held in Ottawa, on March 15th, 1900.

(The report is taken from *La Presse*, March 16th.)

WHERE DOES THE POLITICAL FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE LEAD US ?

The Imperial Federation League, or rather the British Empire League, as it now disguises itself, held its loyal meetings in the Parliament buildings, at Ottawa, on March 15th, 1900. As might have been expected under the circumstances, there was a large crowd present, and great competition of loyalty.

The questions raised were not all new. Many were old and many were academic.

However, so many events have taken place this year that the expression of the opinion of this association, so overflowing with patriotism, on the role created for Canada by the precedent established by the sending off of the Transvaal contingent, might well have been expected. We must now admit that the precedent now exists, since the ministerial party, by its vote on the Bourassa motion, has cancelled from the order-in-council the protective clause inserted by Hon. Mr. Tarte, and thereby decreeing that there is no reserve to be made.

The president of the British Empire League detected the responsibilities to be incurred by Canada in the future as follows :

"The League hopes that the Government shall at once take measures to improve the military standing of the country, not only in respect to the number of available troops, but also in respect to the equipment, instruction, organization, in such a way that we could, in case we need, take our full share in the defence of the interests of the Empire."

"Then we shall have to defend not only the integrity of the Empire, but also the interests of the Empire."

How much ground covered in so little time ! But it is not all.

"Canada should be provided with the best modern war material. We should establish a manufacture of war implements, afford to officers means to keep abreast and be familiar with the modern tactics, have enormous quantities of ammunition in store."

Well, what about money ? But it is not all yet.

"Canada should provide for pensions for its wounded and orphans, and raise a worthy monument, in its capital, to the memory of those who have fallen in Africa."

And the bill still increases.

Lastly—"It is essential that Canada should organize a naval reserve at once, to participate to the maintenance of England's naval supremacy, which is threatened by the incessant armaments of the nations which are its rivals."

This the bill which Imperialism would have to foot.

It was formerly considered good form to smile when the auguries of Imperial Federation yearly presented the list of their "desiderata."

It was enough to smile, without taking the trouble to object, as it was then thought that realizations of such plans would never happen. Well, that time has come. We are in the midst of it and we should get prepared accordingly.

What has just been said is the conclusion of Col. Dennison's report, which report has been approved by the representatives of the Government present at the time.

The Hon. Mr Mulock, representing the Government at the meeting, seconded the adoption of the report, proclaiming at the same time that the time was past when Imperial Federation could only be regarded as an empty dream.

To-day it is an accomplished fact.

Once more, don't you think it is going at too fast a pace ?

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE SENDING OFF OF THE CONTIN- GENTS AND THE BOURASSA MO- TION.

1. Transvaal resolution, 12th July, 1899.

2. Interview with Sir W. Laurier, (Globe, Oct. 3rd, 1899.)

3. Chamberlain's message, declaring to be willing to accept an offer of a contingent. (Oct. 3rd, 1899.)

4. Order in council (no precedent, 13th Oct.)

5. Resolutions relative to expenses of contingent. Bourassa's amendment and vote.

6. Bourassa's motion on the war question.

7. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech.

8. Vote on Bourassa's motion.

9. Mgr. Begin's letter to Mgr. Bruchesi.

10. Articles in L'Electeur, in 1896, on rifle and gun question.

11. Speeches of M. M. Brodeur, Bruneau, Legris, relatively to the guns. (Session 1896.)

THE TRANSVAAL RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY, HOUSE OF COMMONS, JULY 12TH, 1899.

1. Resolved, that this House has viewed with regret the complications which have arisen in the Transvaal Republic, of which Her Majesty is suzerain, from the refusal to accord to Her Majesty's subjects now settled in that region any adequate participation in its Government;

2. Resolved, That this House has learned with still greater regret that the condition of things there existing has resulted in intolerable oppression, and has produced great and dangerous excitement among several classes of Her Majesty's subjects in her South African possessions;

3. Resolved, That this House, representing a people which has largely succeeded, by the adoption of the principle of conceding political rights to every portion of the population, in harmonizing estrangements and in producing general content with the existing system of government, desires to express its sympathy with the efforts of Her Majesty's Imperial authorities to obtain for the subjects of Her Majesty who have taken up their abode in the Transvaal, such measure of justice and political recognition as may be found necessary to secure them in the full possession of equal rights and liberties.

INTERVIEW OF LAURIER WITH A GLOBE REPORTER, OCT. 4, 1899

"There exists a great deal of misconception in the country regarding the powers of the government in the present case," said Sir Wilfrid.

"As I understand the Militia Act, and I may say that I have given it some study of late, our volunteers are enrolled to be used in the defence of the Dominion. They are Canadian troops, to be used to fight in Canada's defence. Perhaps the most widespread misapprehension is that they cannot be sent out of Canada. To my mind it is clear that cases might arise when they might be sent to a foreign land to fight. To postulate a case. Suppose that Spain would declare war upon Great Britain. Spain has, or had, a navy, and that navy might be being got ready to assail Canada as part of the Empire. Sometimes the best method of defending oneself is to attack, and in that case Canadian soldiers might certainly be sent to Spain, and it is quite certain that they legally might be so despatched to the Iberian Peninsula. The case of the South African Republic is not analogous. There is no menace to Canada, and although we are willing to contribute troops, I do not see how we can do so. Then again, how could we do so without Parliament's granting us the money? We simply could not do anything. In other words we should have to summon Parliament. The Government of Canada is restricted in its powers. It is responsible to Parliament, and it can do very little without the permission of Parliament. There is no doubt as to the attitude of the Government on all questions that mean menace to British interests, but in this present case our limitations are very clearly defined. And so it is that we have not offered a Canadian contingent to the Home authorities. The militia Department duly transmitted individual offers to the Imperial Government, and the reply from the War Office, as published in Saturday's Globe, shows their attitude on the question. As to Canada furnishing a contingent, the government has not discussed the question for the reasons which I have stated—reasons which I think must easily be understood by everyone who understands the constitutional law on the question."

CHAMBERLAIN'S MESSAGE.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES SAYS HE IS WILLING TO ACCEPT OFFERS OF A CONTINGENT.

The Secretary of State for the War Office and Commander in Chief desire that you express high appreciation of signal exhibition of patriotic spirit of people in Canada, shown by offers to serve in South Africa, and to furnish following information to assist organization of forces into units suitable for military requirements: Firstly, units should consist of about 125 men; secondly, men may be infantry, mounted infantry or cavalry. In view of numbers already available, infantry most, cavalry least, serviceable. Thirdly, all should be armed with decimal 303 rifles or carbines, which can be supplied by Imperial Government if necessary. Fourthly, all must provide own equipment and mounted troops own horses. Fifthly, not more than one captain and three subalterns each unit. While force may be commanded by officer not higher than major. In considering numbers which can be employed, Secretary of State for War guided by nature of offers, but desires that each colony should be fairly represented and limits necessary, if force is to be fully utilized as integral portion of Imperial forces. They would gladly accept units."

"Conditions as follows: Troops to be disembarked at port of landing, South Africa, fully equipped, at cost of Colonial Government or volunteers. From the date of disembarkation Imperial Government will provide pay, at Imperial rates, supplies and ammunition, and will defray expenses of transport back to Canada and pay wound pensions and compassionate allowances at Imperial rates. Troops to embark not later than 31st October, proceeding direct to Cape Town for orders. Inform accordingly all who have offered to raise volunteers."

ORDER IN COUNCIL OF OCT. 13th, 1899, DECIDING THE SENDING OF THE FIRST CONTINGENT (WITHOUT PRECEDENT.)

The Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to whom the said despatch

was referred, observes that the Colonial Secretary, in answer to the offers which have been sent to him from different parts of Canada, expressing the willingness and anxiety of Canadians to serve Her Majesty's Government in the war which for a long time has been threatening with the Transvaal Republic, and which, unfortunately, has actually commenced, enunciates the conditions under which such offers may be adopted by the Imperial authorities. Those conditions may be practically summed up in the statement that a certain number of volunteers, by units of 125 men, with a few officers, will be accepted to serve in the British army, now operating in South Africa, the moment they reach the coast, provided the expenses of their equipment and transportation to South Africa are defrayed either by themselves or by the Colonial Government.

The Prime Minister, in view of the well known desire of a great many Canadians who are ready to take service under such conditions, is of opinion that the moderate expenditure which would thus be involved for the equipment and transportation of such volunteers may readily be undertaken by the Government of Canada without summoning Parliament, especially as such an expenditure under such circumstances cannot be regarded as a departure from the well known principles of Constitutional Government and colonial practice, nor construed as a precedent for future action.

RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, FEB. 24th, 1899, RELATING TO THE EXPENSES OF THE CONTINGENTS.

1. That it is expedient to provide that from and out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada there shall and may be paid and applied a sum not exceeding in the whole the sum of eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars, being the sum of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars authorized under order-in-council, dated the fourth day of November, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine, and the sum of six hundred thousand dollars authorized by order-in-council, dated the fifth day of January, one thousand nine hundred, towards payment of the expenditure incurred, or to be incurred, in sending the contingents of Canadian volunteers to

South Africa, or in connection therewith, and the members of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada, and the officers and persons who authorized or made the expenditure of any of the said sums under the orders-in-council above referred to, or under any warrant of His Excellency the Governor-General issued in consequence of or on the authority thereof, are hereby indemnified and exonerated from all liability by reason of having used or authorized the use of the above mentioned sums of money, or any portion thereof without due legal authority, and all expenditure heretofore made of any of said sums shall be held to have been lawfully made.

2. In addition to the said sum of eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars referred to in the preceding resolution, there shall and may be paid and applied, from and out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada, a further sum not exceeding in the whole the sum of one million one hundred and fifty thousand dollars towards defraying any further expenditure that may be incurred in connection with the sending of Canadian volunteers for active service in South Africa, and for providing as hereafter mentioned for a fund by way of allowance to such volunteers or their dependents.

3. The word "expenditures" in the foregoing resolutions includes the following:

(a) All expenses of every kind in connection with the raising, enrolling, arming, equipping, provisioning, despatching and transporting of the said contingents up to the time of arrival at the place of debarkation in South Africa;

(b) The payment of the officers, non-commissioned officers and men composing the said contingents up to the time of debarkation as aforesaid at the rates authorized by the regulations and orders of the Department of Militia and Defence;

(c) All separation allowances paid to the wives and children of the married non-commissioned officers and men at the rates laid down by the Imperial regulations;

(d) The difference between the rates of pay of the officers, non-commissioned officers and men, which they receive or are entitled to receive from Her Majesty's Government during their period of service in South Africa

and the respective rates of pay received by them up to the time of debarkation in South Africa—such difference not to be paid to such officer, non-commissioned officers and men, while on such service, but the amount which would be payable to each such officer, non-commissioned officer or man, to be placed to his credit and to be applied in such manner as the Governor-in-Council may determine for the benefit of the dependents on him, or failing such application to be paid to him or his representatives at the close of his period of service.

On the first of March Mr. Bourassa proposed in the general committee that the last clause be struck out. This motion was rejected by a vote of 76 to 3.

THE BOURASSA MOTION MOVED ON MARCH 13TH, 1900.

(Text.)

That this House insist on the principle of the sovereignty and the independence of Parliament as the basis of British institutions and the safeguard of the civil and political liberties of British citizens, and refuses consequently to consider the action of the Government in relation to the South African war as a precedent which should commit this country to any action in the future.

That this House further declares that it opposes any change in the political and military relations which exist at present between Canada and Great Britain, unless such change is initiated by the sovereign will of Parliament and sanctioned by the people of Canada.

SPEECH BY SIR W. LAURIER ON THE BOURASSA MOTION. SIR W. LAURIER SAYS THAT IT IS OF HIS OWN FREE WILL THAT HE HAS SENT THE CANADIANS TO THE TRANSVAAL. HE SAYS THAT ON OTHER OCCASIONS IF IT IS ASKED FOR HE WILL SEND AGAIN TROOPS. MARCH 13TH, 1900.

(Debates page 1830, etc.)

Sir, I understand much better now than I did before what is the reason which has impelled my hon. friend to

tes of pay re-
the time of de-
rica—such dif-
to such officer,
pers and men,
out the amount
le to each such
ed officer or
his credit and
manner as the
y determine for
ndents on him,
tion to be paid
tatives at the
service.

h Mr. Bourassa
eral committee
be struck out.
ected by a vote

OTION MOVED
TH, 1900.

ist on the prin-
ity and the inde-
ent as the basis
ns and the safe-
ed political liber-
ens, and refuses
der the action of
relation to the
r as a precedent
t this country to
ture.

he further declares
change in the pol-
relations which
ween Canada and
s such change is
sovereign will of
ctioned by the

LAURIER ON
MOTION. SIR
YS THAT IT IS
REE WILL THAT
THE CANADIANS
AAL. HE SAYS
R OCCASIONS IF
FOR HE WILL
OOPS. MARCH

1830, etc.)

much better now
what is the reason
my hon. friend to

take the position which he has taken. My hon. friend is opposed to the war; he thinks it is unjust. I do not blame him for holding this view. We are a British country and a free country, and every man in it has the right to express his opinion. My hon. friend has the same right to believe that the war is unjust that Mr. John Morley, Mr. Courtney and many other Liberals in England have to hold the same belief.

But if my hon. friend is of opinion that the war is unjust, for my part I am just as fully convinced in my heart and conscience that there never was a juster war on the part of Great Britain than that war. I am fully convinced that there never was a more unjust war on the part of any man than the war that is now being carried on by President Kruger and the people of the Transvaal. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying this.

If the relations between Great Britain and Canada are to be changed, they can only be changed by the will and with the consent of the people. I am not going to say that the will of the people should be ascertained by a plebiscite, for I believe the well known methods of the constitution are more appropriate.

But the argument of my hon. friend is, that by taking the position we did, we have changed the relations, civil and military, which now exist between Great Britain and Canada. I altogether repudiate that doctrine, and I cannot conceive upon what argument it can be based. I listened carefully to my hon. friend, and I admire him in many ways, but I did not understand the argument on which he based his doctrine that by sending a military contingent to South Africa we have changed the political relations existing between Great Britain and Canada. He went further. He asserted, and still more insinuated than asserted, that in doing what we did, we had been dictated to by Downing Street, that we had been compelled to act by the strong hand of Mr. Chamberlain. He rather insinuated also that in passing the resolution we passed last session, expressing our sympathy with the Uitlanders, we were rather coerced by the will of Mr. Chamberlain. He rather insinuated that the resolution which we then introduced had been

framed by an agent of Mr. Chamberlain. Well, Sir, the fact is that nobody saw that resolution except the hon. leader of the Opposition, who received it from me after it had been adopted by council.

No sir, we were not forced by Mr. Chamberlain, or by Downing Street, and I cannot conceive what my honorable friend meant, when he said that the future of this country was not to be pledged by this government. When and where did we pledge the future of this country? We acted in the full independence of our sovereign power. What we did, we did of our own free will, but I am not to answer for the consequences or for what will take place in the future. My hon. friend says the consequence is that we will be called upon to take part in other wars. I have only this to answer my hon. friend, that if it should be the will of the people of Canada, at any future period to take part in any war of England, the people of Canada will have to have their way.

"But I have no hesitation in saying to my hon. friend that if as a consequence of our action to-day, the doctrine were to be admitted that Canada should take part in all the wars of Great Britain and contribute to the military expenditure of the Empire, I agree with him that we should revise the condition of things existing between us and Great Britain. If we were to be compelled to take part in all the wars of Great Britain, I have no hesitation in saying that I agree with my hon. friend, that sharing the burden, we should also share the responsibility. Under that condition of things, which does not exist, we should have the right to say to Great Britain: If you want us to help you, call us to your councils; if you want us to take part in wars, let us share not only the burdens, but the responsibilities and duties as well. But there is no occasion to examine this contingency this day.

"And did we do anything wrong, after all, and can my hon. friend complain of our action when we simply put it in the power of these young men who wanted to go and give their lives in order to promote what was to them a sacred cause, to go to the front? Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if ever there was an occasion when we should have no

voice of dissent in this House, it is the present occasion.

"I greatly admired the speech of my hon. friend, though I am far from sharing his views. But I call upon him to remember that he belongs to a patriotic family, as he said to us to-day.

"I call upon him to remember that the liberties which we enjoy are largely due to his own family. But if we have liberties on one side would he not accept some duties on the other side? Would he not accept some obligations on the other side? Shall the sacrifice be all on one side and none on the other? The obligations all on one side and none on the other?

"We were not compelled to do what we did; but if we chose to be generous, to do a little more than we are bound to do, where is the man living who would find fault with us for that action?"

VOTE ON THE BOUROSSA MOTION.

Yeas—Messieurs Angers, Bourassa, Chauvin, Dugas, Ethier, Legris, March, Marcotte, Monet and Morin.—10.

Nays—Messieurs Bazinet, Beith,

Belcourt, Bell (Prince), Bennett, Bergeron, Bernier, Bethune, Blair, Borden (Halifax), Bostock, Britton, Broder, Brown, Bruneau, Campbell, McGill Caron (Sir Adolphe), Carroll, Casey, Casgrain, Champagne, Clancy, Cochrane, Comstock, Copp, Corby, Cowan, Craig, Davies (Sir Louis), Echeene, Demers, Desmarais, Douglas, Dupre, Dymet, Edwards, Erb, Featherston, Fielding, Fisher, Flint, Fortier, Fortin, Foster, Fraser (Guysboro'), Fraser (Lambton), Ganong, Gauthier, Gauvreau, Geoffrion, Gibson, Gilmour, Godbout, Gould, Graham, Guillet, Henderson, Holmes, Hurley, Hutchison, Ingram, Johnston, Joly de Lotbiniere (Sir H. J.), Kaulbach, Kendry, Kloepper, Lang, LaRiviere, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Livingston, Macdonell (Selkirk), Mackie, McLaren, McAlister, McCleary, McClure, McGugan, McIsaac, McLellan (Prince), McLennan (Inverness), McMillan, McMullen, McNeill, Madore, Malouin, Martin, Meigs, Mignault, Mills, Moore, Mulock, Parmalee, Patterson, Pettet, Prior, Proulx, Puttee, Roche, Roddick, Rogers, Rosamond, Ross, Russell, Rutherford, Savard, Snetsinger, Somerville, Sproule, Stenson, Stubbs, Sutherland, Talbot, Taylor, Tolmie, Tucker, Tyrwhitt, Wilson, and Wood.—119.

Letter of Mgr. Begin to Mgr. Bruchesi, on the loyalty of the French Canadians, about articles published in the *Semaine Religieuse de Quebec*, and the attacks of Protestant papers, April 1900.

It is truly deplorable that the history of our country should be so little known. One century and a half of frank and unflinching loyalty to the British Crown should be sufficient to convince our brother countrymen of English origin of our love towards the flag which shelters us.

The loyalty of the French Canadian bishops and priests! Why, it is written in golden letters, in lines of fire, in the annals of history, and all the sovereigns, all their representatives who have followed each other

here, since the cession of Canada to England, all the them have rendered them solemn and cordial testimonials in that respect, even those with whom there had to be legal struggles for the defence of most legitimate rights.

Shall I here recall the memory of Mgr. Briand, who occupied the episcopal seat of Quebec at the turning point in the history of the "Nouvelle France." Living alternately under the "fleur de lis" standard and the British flag, he remained loyal to the

Bennett, Berne, Blair, Brodie, Britton, Bro Campbell, Charolphe), Carroll, Chapagne, Chancy, Copp, Corby, es (Sir Louis), Carais, Douglas, ds, Erb, Featherer, Flint, Fraser (Guys- bton), Ganong, Geoffrion, Gib- t, Gould, Gra- rson, Holmes, gram, Johnston, (Sir H. J., Kaul- pfer, Lang, La- Wilfrid), Living- kirk), Mackie, McCleary, Mc- Isaac, McLellan (Inverness), Mc- Neill, Madore, Meigs, Mignault, Parmalee, Pat- Proulx, Puttee, gers, Rosamond, herford, Savard, e, Sproule, Sten- nd, Talbot, Tay- Tyrwhitt, Wil-

esi, on the
ans, about
e Relieuse
Protestant

cession of
and, all the
ndered them
testimonials in
ose with whom
al struggles for
egitimate rights.
the memory of
occupied the epis-
at the turning
of the "Nouvelle
ternately under
andard and the
ined loyal to the

first of these until, on the plains of Abraham all was lost but honor, then generously transferring his loyalty to the second, he used his influence to the utmost in those terrible days of 1775, urging French Canada to be faithful to its new masters? And yet it can well be imagined how strong was the temptation to these children of France in America, to throw in their lot with that of the New England inhabitants who were less scrupulous and less loyal than these—and it might be added—less ill-treated and more easily forgiven their real and efficacious rebellion, than we are to-day for an imaginary disloyalty. If the Catholic emissaries of the United States; if the warm appeal of the French officers who were then serving the cause of American independence could not prevail against their assistance of the Canadians, it is because the loud voice of the chief of the church at Quebec, appealing on the ground of the sacred principles of respect due to the reigning authority and stigmatizing with the name of the rebel those who answered the call, opposed to revolution an unpassable barrier.

And England, already deprived of the richer portion of its American heirloom, owed to a French bishop that Canada was retained as one of the most precious jewels of the Imperial Crown.

I might still go on—if would not be brief—and recall acts of Mgr. Denant, whose loyalty to England took the form of heroic generosity, also Mgr. Plessis, who in 1807, reminded the faithful of his diocese that it was impossible to be a good Christian without being loyal and faithful "and" that they would be unworthy of the names of Catholics and Canadians if they showed disloyalty or even indifference in the accomplishments of their duties as subjects loyal to the interests of their Sovereign or to the defence of the country." This illustrious prelate in 1812 entirely devoted himself to keep the Canadians loyal to British allegiance and succeeded in doing so. The same stand was taken by Mgr. Panet, the maternal uncle of the lamented Cardinal Taschereau.

Then during the regrettable days of 1837-38 we see Mgr. L. Legray, in

Quebec, and one of your predecessors, Mgr. Lartigue, in Montreal, who intervene in the name of religion to appease the fratricide struggles; this act of loyalty often brought them bitter words of reproach from some of their countrymen but it was a duty considered sacred and they accomplished it, despite all the other considerations.

Later we have Mgr. Baillargeau, who shows the same line of conduct to the members of his fold at the time of the Fenian invasion, and also Mgr. Tache, who at a very critical moment, pacifies his half breeds and keeps them loyal to England.

And if dared to quote myself, I could repeat what I said in France, in the cathedral of Rheims during the great solemnization of the 14th anniversary of the conversion of Clovis and his frank warriors, that while still having great affection for our late Mother Country we were happy to live under the shelter of the British flag and that we were inhabitants of one of the freest countries of the globe.

As may be seen, history has repeated itself since the cession of Canada up to our days and it will again repeat itself as long as there is a Catholic bishop in Canada. Our good friends seem to sometimes forget that loyalty for children of our church is not a matter of sentiment or of personal interest, but it is a serious and unyielding duty of the conscience derived from a sacred principle, immovable and as everlasting as the Divine Legislator.

Let them therefore be easy in mind as to the attitude of the Catholic clergy in such cases; the past has been unflinching, the future shall be equally so, for our Catholic principles do not change.

As a matter of fact, I do not hesitate to state that even among the highest English aristocracy, it would not be possible to find a body of men more loyal to the British Crown than the clergy of the province of Quebec. This should be sufficient to shelter us from imputations devoid of all foundation, and often misplaced and unjust.

If ever—which heaven may forbid—

the question of annexation to the United States were seriously discussed, it would be interesting to see the respective attitudes of the two nationalities, namely Anglo-Canadians and French-Canadians facing this event. I am thoroughly convinced

that we would not have to blush of the behavior of our compatriots in such an occurrence; they would undoubtedly once more perform their duty as loyal subjects to Her British Majesty.

L'Electeur of the 17th June, 1896, condemns the purchase of Rifles by the Conservatives, now it advocates war for the Empire.

Do you want war? -- Three million dollars for rifles, guns and bayonets. -- Imminent danger for the farmer.

In 1896, L'Electeur says:

"One of the hobbies of old Tupper is the Imperial Federation. Imperial Federation means a closer alliance between England and her colonies in general, and Canada in particular.

"One of the conditions of this alliance is that in time of war, Canada would be called upon to participate in the expense in money and in men.

"And as England is almost always at war with someone, we would have to be continually taxing ourselves to provide money and have conscriptions to provide men.

In return England would confer on those knaves titles of Baronet, Knights of this and Commanders of that.

But the people would remain flesh for the battle-field.

Sir Charles Tupper has barely returned from England that he begins to prepare the way towards the realization of his horrible scheme.

England was threatened to have some difficulties with the United States about a few acres of mining lands which she claimed as hers in the Venezuela, thousand of miles distant from our country, in Central America. Immediately in an access of "show off" Sir Charles hastens to order the purchase in England of rifles and guns, etc., to the extent of ONE MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS, (\$1,800,000), in the middle of the session, without consulting the House.

This was not sufficient.

He wanted three millions.

Mr. Foster, on April 21st, 1896, (Hansard page 6902) proposes a resolution to authorize a loan of three million dollars for payment of purchases effected and to be made.

These had been ordered at the time 40,000 rifles Lee-Enfield and 23,000 carbines for the cavalry. There had also been ordered four batteries of six guns, of 12, with necessary ammunition.

The rifles cost \$18 each.

The carbines for the cavalry cost more than forty thousand dollars.

The bayonets and scabbards cost four dollars.

Then there were to be purchased:

Fifty Maxim guns, 200 set of harness for dray horses.

400 sets of saddles for cavalry.

These cost \$100 a set.

Where as they could be had there for \$40.

And fifty-nine thousand dollars for the harness alone.

Why should these harnesses be bought abroad?

Everything for the others, nothing for you.

Why did the Tupper Government, who expostulates the benefits to be derived by the Canadian industry from the protection policy, buy \$165,000 worth of harness in England, instead of ordering them from Canadian saddlers?

"Why were \$100 paid for each set of these harness when they could be had for \$40 ?

"And why all this armament if we are not to have any war?

"And why should we fight for England's interests ?

"The electors should remember that these big chiefs who are always anxious to show themselves to be more patriotic than others, more loyal than others, and always ready to launch us into a war for others' benefit, are not the ones on whom the burden weighs most.

"These rifles, these guns, the electors will be called upon to handle them. You are good enough to be meat for the battlefield, The Tupperts, the Angers, the Tallions, will remain in their ministerial offices, from whence they will send us to meet death with joy in their heart and a glass of champagne in the hand. Once again, what are these rifles and these bayonets for if Tup-

per & Co. are not meditating some underhand scheme.

"Your children shall be sent to Africa, to Asia, whence they shall never return.

"If you vote for Conservative candidates you approve of all these participations of war. Does the Government come to your help when you are burdened by taxes, or when misfortune strikes you in the shape of a flood or a fire ? And three million dollars have been spent on guns.

"Vote for Laurier and his candidates if you wish to see your country enjoy the same happiness and easiness of mind, and do not wish to expose yourselves to be sent away one day to foreign countries, leaving behind you your wives, children and all that is dear to you."

The moral of all this is the Liberals did in 1899 all they denounced so emphatically in 1896, and that without the guns, the rifles and the harness, the poor Canadian soldiers would have been all the same sent to Africa to be massacred without glory.

The Liberal Members in the Opposition in 1896, and the purchase of Rifles by the Conservatives.

MR. L. P. BRODEUR, M. P., DEPUTY SPEAKER.

There is one feature in connection with this vote which puzzles me. We have over and again been told that in the event of a war taking place or Canada being invaded, we could rely on Great Britain's protection, and that the only ground for not severing the colonial tie was that, should international difficulties arise, we might rely on England's strong arm. Now, sir, I am sorry to hear under the circumstances that the Government, for the purpose of arming the Canadian militia, have made their purchases, not from private contractors, but from the War Office in Great Britain, and that we are asked now to foot the bills. Is that the protection we have been promised by Great Britain ? Is that the position in which we stand as a colony ? I think we are entitled to an altogether different treatment at the hands of Great Britain. Now, sir, under the circumstances, I believe that it is our duty to refuse granting the Government the authority to raise that amount of four million dollars, and

I, for one, am in favor of refusing to give the Government this item.

Parliament is asked to foot this bill at a time when the Government are rolling up the public debt by millions, at a time when it reaches \$300,000,000. I believe that our public debt is large enough without our jingoes adding to it a few more millions for an unwarrantable expenditure. I do not think this expenditure is called for under the circumstances, and I, for one, am strongly opposed to authorizing the money to pay that expenditure.—(Debates 1896, p. p. 6172, 6173.)

MR. BRUNEAU, M.P., RICHELIEU.

Undoubtedly this is an unwarrantable expenditure, owing to the heavy public debt with which our people are loaded down and seeing also that there is no absolute necessity for the Militia Department purchasing rifles as they have done. I say, Mr. Chairman, that such an expenditure is

unwarrantable, because we still are a British dependency and Great Britain has always promised us her active aid in our hour of need. Such expenditure is unwarranted on the further ground that we are at peace with the whole world. This expenditure is altogether uncalled for on this further ground—and I beg to say so before this House and the country with all the Chauvinism of which I am a fervent adept, and in spite of the loyalty professed by the French-Canadian people for Great Britain, a loyalty evinced now as in the past by their readiness to shed their blood and expend their money for the defence of the country—but, I say, the people of our country are unwilling to incur such expenditures to fight for the whims of England.

MR. LEGRIS, M. P., MASKINONGE.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity slip by without registering my protest not only against the unwarrantable course followed by the Government in this matter, but also against the ill-advised and enormous expenditure incurred by this moribund Government. The Government would do far better, to my mind, to seek to alleviate the charges with which our people are loaded down rather than increasing the public debt and incurring liabilities as useless as those which they are now asking Parliament to authorize. That expenditure of one million dollars for purchasing arms is an ill-timed and unwarrantable one, under the circumstances.

nt to let
thout re-
ly against
flowed by
atter, but
and enor-
by this
e Govern-
to my
he charges
are loaded
g the pub-
ilities as
are now
rize. That
dollars for
imed and
he circum-

THE SCHOOL QUESTION

WHAT THE CONSERVATIVES DID TO SETTLE THE QUESTION.

How far advanced are the Catholics of Manitoba after four years of the Laurier Regime.

The Conservatives and the School Question. What they did from 1890 to 1896.

We do not intend to open here a discussion on the Manitoba school question.

But the Liberals pretend that the Conservatives had six years to settle the question and have done nothing towards that end. That is false.

For six years not one single day passed without the question being in some active judicial or administrative phase towards its solution.

Here follows the chronology of the events relative to the school question from the adoption of the Greenway law in Manitoba, until the fall of the Conservative Government.

In 1900 the Hon. M. Greenway passed that act, abolishing the French and Catholic schools in Manitoba to pass through the Manitoba Legislation.

In 1890 the Hon. Mr. Blake, the leader of the Liberal party, foreseeing the troubles which might in the future arise from educational and confessional complications caused a resolution to be adopted by Parliament, which was later embodied in a bill, by which all questions of dis-

avowal or of appeal in educational questions were to be referred to the supreme court. This tended to withdraw the settlement of such questions from the political scope.

On November 24th, 1890, the Catholics of Winnipeg attacked the school law, and demanded from the court of the Queen's bench to have the regulation of the city of Winnipeg, imposing a tax on them for public schools, to be cancelled. This was the case of Barrett, which was carried to the Privy Council.

This demand was refused.

On February 2nd, 1891, the Catholics appealed to the complete court of the Queen's bench.

The demand was rejected.

October 28th, 1891, appeal to the supreme court. This court declares the Manitoba School Act "ultra vires," that is to say unconstitutional.

On April 30th, 1892, the Manitoba Government, who has appealed to the Privy Council in England, sees at last its law pronounced constitution-

al.

In August, 1890, the Manitoba Catholics applied to the Government at Ottawa, according to sections 93 and 22 of the British North American Act, and the Manitoba Act, demanding the adjustments of their complaints.

On April 4th, 1891, an order-in-council was passed answering the request and hinting that the Government was not taking immediate action on account of the case Barrett being then before the Privy Council, but that if the decision of the council were adverse to the demands of the Catholics the Government would take action.

On September 27th, 1891, the Privy Council having decided against the demands of the Catholics in the Barrett case, they sent a new petition to Ottawa asking that their appeal to the Governor-in-Council be law.

On December 29th, 1892, an order-in-council decides that Jan. 31, 1893, would be the date to hear the parties before the Canadian Privy Council.

On Jan. 31st, 1893, the hearing of the parties takes place; Manitoba is not represented. A special committee is called to decide on the policy to be adopted.

On July 31st, 1893, an order-in-council decides to consult the supreme court, according to the regulation passed at the instance of the Hon. Mr. Blake, to know if the Manitoba school law could come into the class of those for which an appeal could be made to the Governor-General in council.

On Oct. 3rd, 1893, the case is submitted to the supreme court, who decide against the rights demanded by the Manitoba Catholics.

In May, 1894, the Bishops of Canada send to the Government at Ottawa a request asking the repulsion of the Manitoba law. This repulsion would have been constitutionally impossible at that time. The disallowance must take place within the year of the promulgation of the law attacked, and the demand for this non-recognition of the law had not been made in time.

On July 26th, 1894, an order-in-council decides to refer to the Manitoba Government the request demanding the repulsion, at the same time pointing out the general wish to see the law modified.

October, 1894. Manitoba Government intimates to the Ottawa Government that it is impossible to modify the law passed in 1890.

December, 1894. The Ottawa Government appeals to the Privy Council in England to have a final decision as to whether they have the constitutional right according to the Federal acts of 1867 and 1870, to listen to the appeal of the Catholics and to grant their demands.

On Jan. 29th, 1895, judgment is rendered by the Privy Council to the effect that the Governor-General has jurisdiction, etc., that the act of Manitoba, previous to 1890, had conferred a right or privilege to the minority relating to the education question, etc., and that both acts of 1890, which give rise to the complaints have wronged the right or privilege to the extent of justifying an effect that the Governor-General has council.

And Her Majesty, on the judgment of the Privy Council, in Osbourne House Court, in the Isle of Wight, on February 6th, 1895, after having taken in consideration the said judgment, and on the advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council, has been pleased to approve the said report of the Lords of the Committee, and order that the recommendations and instructions contained, be observed, obeyed and executed to the letter. The Governor-General for Canada and others whom it may concern are to take knowledge for their guidance.

On the 4th, 5th and 6th of March, 1895, the Conservative Government, complying with the decision of the Privy Council, heard the Manitoba appeal.

On the 29th of March, 1895, the remedying measure was adopted and transmitted to Manitoba.

On June 19th, 1895, the Government of Manitoba informed the Ottawa Government that they did not think expedient to comply with the

94, an order-in-
request demand-
the same time
oral wish to see

Manitoba Govern-
the Ottawa Gov-
possible to mod-
1890.

the Ottawa Gov-
the Privy Council
a final decision as
ave the constitu-
ing to the Federal
70, to listen to
Catholics and to

95, judgment is
y Council to the
ernor-General has
at the act of
to 1890, had con-
vilege to the min-
e education ques-
that both acts of
use to the com-
d the right or pri-
t of justifying an
ernor-General has

on the judgment
ncil, in Osbourne
Isle of Wight, on
95, after having
ion the said judg-
advice of Her Ma-
l, has been pleas-
said report of the
mittee, and order
dations and in-
ed, be observed,
ted to the letter.
al for Canada and
y concern are to
their guidance.

and 6th of March,
tive Government,
decision of the
ard the Manitoba

March, 1895, the
re was adopted
Manitoba.

1895, the Govern-
nformed the Otta-
at they did not
comply with the

prescriptions of the remediating bill.

On July 8th, 1895, the Hon. Mr. Foster, leader of the House of Commons, declares in the name of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Government, that the Government still had hopes to induce Mr. Greenway to accept the bill and had decided to wait until January following, hoping for the submission of Manitoba, before attempting to pass a remediating legislation.

On July 11th, 1895, the House accepted this policy by a vote of 119 to 12.

On January 2nd, 1896, the Federal Government, having failed in its attempts to induce Manitoba to render justice unto the demands of the Catholics, called the House to pass a legislation called the Remediating Bill.

On March 3rd, 1896, Sir Charles Tupper, leader of the House, proposes the second reading of the bill.

On March 3rd, 1896, the Hon. W. Laurier, Chief of the Liberal party, proposes reconsideration at six months.

On March 20th, 1896, the second reading, that is to say, the principle of the bill, is adopted by 119 to 94.

Therefore the Conservative majority had kept its word and voted the remediating measures.

Once beaten, the Liberal opposition tried with all their might to stop the bill going through the committee.

The obstruction began on March 20th, and continued without interruption until April 15th, the House sitting night and day.

On April 15th, 1898, the government convinced of the impossibility to put the law through, on account of the obstruction in the time left before closing, and having to obtain the subsidies, abandons the bill in committee.

On April 23rd, 1896, Parliament dissolved.

On June 23rd, 1896, general elections took place and the Hon. Wil-

frid Laurier was put in power on the strength of his promises to do more for the Catholics than was insured by the Remediating Bill.

We know what he has done in the matter. He has trampled under foot the judgment of the Privy Council.

Instead of insisting on the granting of their rights to the Catholics, he concluded an agreement without responsibility, and which might be called a shameful compromise.

During six years the Conservatives worked step by step to obtain the remediation through judicial and constitutional means.

They had almost touched the goal when the Liberals stopped them in this great work.

The Liberals have been in power for four years.

They had promised to do better to cause justice to be rendered, to nominate a commission with the Hon. Mr. Mowat.

We shall now see how far advanced now stand the Manitoba Catholics.

AT WHAT STAGE ARE THE MANITOBA CATHOLICS NOW?—WHAT THEIR DEMANDS WERE.

The Manitoba Catholic minority has since 1890 been asking for these things:

(a) Separate schools.

(b) A grant to maintain them.

(c) Exemption of taxes for the maintenance of Protestant schools.

WHAT THEY HAVE OBTAINED.

By the judgment rendered on January 29, 1895, by the Lords of the Justice Committee of the Privy Council, and by the Order-in-Council of Her Majesty the Queen, in Council, dated February 2nd, 1895, it has been decreed that the Catholic minority in Manitoba has just complaints, the adjustment of which, as question of appeal to be decided, falls

under the jurisdiction of the Governor-General in Council.

WHAT THE CONSERVATIVES HAVE DONE.

The Governor-General in Council, by an order of the 21st of March, 1895 (Conservative administration) has ordered the Manitoba Legislature to alter its school legislation so as to give the Catholic minority in Manitoba:

(a) The right to build, maintain, furnish, manage the Roman Catholic schools as stated by the Acts annulled by the statutes of 1890.

(b) Right to a share of the grants made from public funds for the need of public education.

(c) The right for Roman Catholics who contribute towards the maintenance of Roman Catholic schools, to be exempted from contributions to be devoted to the maintenance of other schools.

WHAT WAS DONE BY THE GOVERNMENT.

The Manitoba Legislature, far from heeding these prescriptions, answered in the negative.

(a) By a first refusal on June 25, 1895.

(b) By a second refusal on December 21st, 1895, rejecting a tentative of conciliation.

(c) By a third refusal given to the delegates sent to Winnipeg on March 28th, 1896.

THE CONSERVATIVES INSIST.

Before this treble refusal, the Conservative Government proposed a mediating legislation, substituting the Canadian Parliament for the Manitoba Legislature, within the measure of justice to be granted to the Manitoba majority towards the adjustment of their complaints.

The principle of this legislation was accepted by the House of Commons on March 20th, 1896, by the adoption of the second reading of the bill, by a vote of 112 to 94.

WHAT THE LIBERALS HAVE DONE

The final adoption of the Remedying Bill was hindered by a long discussion which lasted until the natural dissolution of Parliament.

WHAT THE LIBERALS PROMISED.

At the general elections of 1896, the Liberal party made to the electors a solemn promise to render full and entire justice to the demands of the Catholic minority, as it appears from the following statements published by the papers and put before the voters.

(a) Abstract from a speech delivered by the Hon. W. Laurier in the Jacques Cartier Hall at Quebec, May 7th, 1896, as published by L'Electeur of May 1st, 1896.

"I do not wish my intentions to be misunderstood, I repeat it here, I wish full justice to be rendered unto the Catholic minority in Manitoba. This principle is written in golden letters in my party programme, that the rights of a minority must be respected.

"If the people of Canada give me the power, as I am convinced they will, the question shall be settled to the satisfaction of all interested parties. I shall have in my government Sir Oliver Mowat, who in Ontario has always been the champion of Separate schools, and of the Catholic minority at the risk of his own popularity. I shall put him in the lead of a commission in which the interests at stake shall be represented and I can affirm that I shall succeed to satisfy those who are at present suffering. Is not Sir Oliver Mowat name a guarantee of the success of this?

"Lastly, if conciliation cannot succeed, I shall have to have recourse to the constitutional power afforded by law, which power I shall use completely."

(b) Declaration signed by the Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick, (Hansard for 1896, p. 139).

Being sincerely disposed to set aside all party spirit and all questions of men, in order to secure

WHAT HAVE DONE

of the Remediat-
by a long dis-
until the natu-
rulent.

WHAT IS PROMISED.

lections of 1896,
made to the elec-
tione to render full
to the demands of
ty, as it appears
statements pub-
s and put before
a speech deliver-
W. Laurier in the
all at Quebec, May
published by L'Elec-
1896.

my intentions to be
repeat it here, I
to be rendered un-
minority in Manitoba.
s written in golden
ty programmes, that
minority must be re-

of Canada give me
am convinced they
on shall be settled to
of all interested par-
ve in my government
at, who in Ontario
en the champion of
s, and of the Catholic
risk of his own pop-
I put him in the lead
in which the inter-
shall be represented
n that I shall succe-
se who are at presen-
ot Sir Oliver Mowat
tee of the success

conciliation cannot suc-
ave to have recourse to
onal power afforded by
power I shall use con-

ion signed by the Hon.
rick, (Hansard for 1896)

erely disposed to
ty spirit and all que-
in order to secure

triumph of the Catholic cause in
Manitoba, I the undersigned, promise
I elected to conform myself to the
Bishop's mandement in all points and
to vote for a measure according to
the Catholics of Manitoba that jus-
tice to which they have a right by
virtue of the judgment of the Privy

Council, provided that the measure
be approved of by the Bishop. If
Mr Laurier reaches power, and does
not settle the question at the first
session in accordance with the terms
of the mandement, I promise either
to withdraw my support or resign.
(Signed) Chas. Fitzpatrick.

WHAT THE CONSERVATIVES OF- FERED.

After the general elections, at the
first sitting of the 8th Parliament,
the leader of the opposition, the Hon.
Sir Charles Tupper, on August 24th,
1896, made the following statement,
entered in the official reports of the
Debates, House of Commons, Vol.
XIII., column 49.

"That in the future, as in the past,
the cardinal principle of the great
party to which I have the honor to
belong, will be: Equal justice to all,
without respect to race or creed. I
am glad to know that the responsi-
bility of this question—an important
question, although not so gravely
important as I had supposed—I am
glad to know that the responsibility
rests no longer on my shoulders, but
upon those of the honorable gentle-
man who is now the First Minister
of the Crown. I can only say that I
trust and sincerely hope that he will
be most successful in obtaining such
a settlement of this question as will
do justice and give satisfaction to all
parties. I can assure the honorable
gentleman not only that he has my
most cordial wishes in a happy and
early and fair settlement of this im-
portant question, but that anything
that I can contribute to that end
will be at all times most cheerfully
done."

WHAT THE SETTLEMENT OF LAU- RIER AND GREENWAY IS.

The present government did not
avail themselves of this offer of the
leader of the opposition, and did not
take this opportunity to settle the
Manitoba school question, so as to
give justice to the minority.

Without the consent of either the
opposition leader, or of the interest-
ed Catholic minority, the present
government began negotiations with
the Manitoba Government; a confer-
ence was held, with the representa-
tives of this Government, and a set-
tlement was agreed upon, which set-
tlement was ratified by the Manitoba
Legislature.

This settlement does not settle defi-
nitely the Manitoba school question,
and cannot be considered even as a
beginning towards justice being ren-
dered.

The settlement was not accepted by
the Catholic minority.

This settlement grants to the Cath-
olic minority not a single one of the
three demands: (a) Separate schools;
(b) Necessary grant for their main-
tenance; (c) Exemption of taxes
raised for the maintenance of Protest-
ant schools.

Such is the state we are in; such
is the work of the Liberals.

The English Speaking Conservative leaders and the French Canadians.

Sir Charles Tupper and the Hon. Geo. E. Foster.

Speech makers and the press of the Liberals have insinuated that Sir Charles had doubted the loyalty of the French Canadians.

They tried to assail the name of this noble old man, by accusing him of being prejudiced against our race and our compatriots.

Never was such reproach, such accusations so undeserved.

It gave rise to an indignant answer from the leader of the Conservative party, who in stirring terms protested against such an unworthy accusation.

His speech is officially entered in the proceedings of the House, but facts speak louder than words.

Sir Charles Tupper has to his credit forty-five years of active service in politics. Never has this long and brilliant career ever been tainted with the least touch of fanaticism or prejudice. It was worthy of the associates of the oppressors of the Manitoba Catholics to denounce the worthy old fighter as deserving the hatred of the French-Canadians. The attempt was not a success for everybody knows with what broad views, with what magnanimous and unshaken impartiality Sir Charles has treated the various nationalities in this blending which constitutes the Dominion of Canada.

Never could anyone discover in him a shade of preference or partiality towards one of his, to the detriment of one of ours, and this tact is so developed that he shows the same pleasure in the company of and intercourse with French-Canadians that he does with his own countrymen. When such opportunities present themselves to point out such sentiments, we like doing it.

In his speech in the House of Com-

mons, Sir Charles alluded to various times when his appreciation of our race showed itself plainly.

He recalled, for instance, the Cartier incident in 1867, when the Queen gave to Mr. John A. Macdonald a knighthood and made Mr. George E. Cartier simply a companion of the Bath. This unhappy distinction looked very much like a plot broached at Rideau Hall. Mr. Cartier drew out his protest with A. T. Galt, Finance Minister. Several of these documents were entered in the blue books, but the private documents, much more interesting than the law before the public, remained in Sir George's private papers. There are in these two very notable letters, one from Mr. Archibald, who was later appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and who was then secretary of State, and another from Sir Charles Tupper. His last one, particularly touching, protested against the injustice which had been committed and offering his services to have the wrong repaired, emanated from whole-souled sentiments; and subsequent events have proved that the offer were not merely superficial and conventional, for Mr. Cartier soon after received a baronetcy. Mr. Tupper has refused a portfolio in order to insure confederation of the provinces, but then yielding to unsettled elements was a politician comparatively unknown. It must be recognized if Tupper had followed his personal interest he would have courted Sir John Macdonald, the Prime Minister, for he was merely a member of Parliament without numerical support in the House.

Those who knew the history of the country can also testify as to his sincerity when in 1883 Sir John, a

Conservative
Canadians.

Geo. E. Foster.

s alluded to various appreciation of our If plainly. or instance, the Car- 1867, when the Queen on A. Macdonald a made Mr. George E. a companion of the happy distinction look- ke a plot broached at Cartier drew out his T. Galt, Finance Min- of these documents in the blue books. private documents. interesting than the law ic, remained in Sir e papers. There are notable letters, one hibald, who was later eutenant-Governor of who was then secre and another from Sir His last one, partic t, protested against his had been committed s services to have th emanated from whol ents; and subsequen proved that the offer ely superficial and cor Mr. Cartier soon af neteey. Mr. Tupper ha folio in order to insu of the provinces, b to unsettled element an comparatively u st be recognized if Tuv ed his personal inte have courted Sir Joh e Prime Minister, for a member of Parliame erical support in t

knew the history of t also testify as to his s in 1883 Sir John, a

pointed to the Privy Council of Great Britain, thought of leaving the arena of the Government. Mr. J. A. Chap-leau used to recall that at a semi-official conference Sir Charles emphat-ically declared his unwillingness to take the succession while Sir Hector Langevin was yet in active politics. "Sir Hector is my senior in politics," he said, "to him reverts the honour."

Here is now a third incident which proves the interest which Sir Charles bears towards the French-Canadians.

It can be asserted that the trade treaty between Canada and France was nothing more than a tribute to the French-Canadians, for the other provinces were quite indifferent to it. No one will realize how many years and how much indefatigable persistency were devoted by Sir Charles to that work, which failed in 1880, 1881 and 1883. Mr. C. A. Dansereau was at the time with him in Paris, witness of all his efforts since he had to intervene to translate French into English and vice versa, both in documents and in conversations. The difficulties were innumerable; for the British Ambassador, Lord Lyons, put, very diplomatically, all the obstructions possible, while the French Government always hindered by the clause of "the most favored nation" did not feel at liberty to make any concessions to Canada. Sir Charles would then return to London, where he was acting as High Commissioner, then he would return to Paris the following week with new arguments. If ever tenacity was worthy of admiration, it was in this situation almost desperate, which caused Sir Charles to cross the English channel six times in one month. One day that the horizon seemed to be darker than ever, turning towards Mr. Dansereau, he exclaimed: "Tell them that what I ask them for is for Frenchmen like them."

This exclamation, stamped with enthusiasm, carried the day, and from that time the broad lines of the treaty were adopted. Unfortunately, on the very next day Sir Charles received a cable from Sir John A. Macdonald requesting him to return post haste. It was to give the Canadian Pacific Railway the Government guarantee of \$60,000,000, the existence of that immense enterprise being then at stake. Governments change rapid-

ly in France, the opportunity was lost, and an additional and incessant work of ten years was required to attain his aim, which he desired so heartily in such a disinterested way. For, it is due to him that the negotiations of 1893, '94 and '95 were brought to a point.

If it is said anywhere that Sir Charles has said anything against the French-Canadians, it would be safe to take the very contrary as being the truth.

THE HON. MR. FOSTER AND THE FRENCH-CANADIANS.

In the same way as was tried for Sir Charles Tupper, the Liberals accused the Hon. Mr. Foster to entertain towards the French-Canadians sentiments of contempt and hostile.

But it is not so much Mr. Foster who was accused as one of his friends of Queen's County, Mr. Hetherington, to have proffered insults towards the Canadians and Catholics.

This is utterly false.

Here follows a letter from Mr. Hetherington, written eight days after the meeting in question, on Nov. 20th, 1899, flatly denying the charges made against him:

"From the point of self-respect, I must declare that I am so opposed to any agitation of a religious or national nature in Canadian politics that I believe my duty to denounce such an agitation in all political meetings which I have addressed. I have always carefully avoided to use words which could be misconstrued as attacks on the religious beliefs of any of the hearers or any other citizen. I have often addressed meetings where a good proportion was composed of Catholics, and if the Government papers can find in the counties of King and Sunbury a single Catholic who can say that I have in any way attacked the Catholic religion, I shall retire from active politics. I can say even more; I am willing to deliver the same speeches before an Acadian audience that I delivered in Bruns- wick, and if the Acadians can say that I prefer insults towards their race (unless they should consid-

er Laurier and Tarte having the only true French patriotism) I will consent at the next election to vote for the Government.

"I can assert that there is neither religious or national controversies in the county of Queens as far as the Liberal-Conservative party is concerned.

"And the only agitation now existing rests only on the misleading hopes of the Government partizans who want to give more emphasis to the anti-Protestant and anti-English campaign led by Mr. Tarte in Quebec; as this campaign cannot have much effect, we do not need to have recourse to such desperate expedients as those used by the Government. A drowning man clings to a straw, and a Government which is going to disappear uses means, to retain the power, which are worthy of the American Yellow Press."

Speaking at a meeting in Queens County shortly after the incident, Mr. Hetherington emphatically denied all what had been said against him. A local paper reports as follows:

"Speaking of affidavits now famous (or rather infamous) Mr. Hetherington says that they are absolutely false. He was given to understand that these sworn statements had been sent to Quebec; they were being distributed widely among the public so as to work up a propaganda in favor of Mr. Tarte. It was thought safer not to distribute these depositions throughout our province, as all those who know the parties who signed them, or the magistrate who swore them in, would not pay any attention to them.

"It was hoped that they would have more weight before strangers. Mr. Hetherington declared that those who want to arouse feelings and prejudices of race and of religion in the country, were all partisans of the Government, that Mr. Tarte specially was trying to arouse a war of race and religion in Quebec for political purposes. As to himself, Mr. Hetherington never said that a descendant of French blood should never have been Canada's Prime Minister."

This is what Mr. Hetherington declared at a political meeting, and many of the audience had heard Mr. Hetherington in previous meetings, and could fully understand that he meant what he said.

Here follows an affidavit, signed by eight electors, and which reads:—

"We, the undersigned electors in the Parish of Brunswick, Queen's county, after being sworn in declare as follows:—

"That we were present at the meeting: called for the purpose of organizing the election, and have heard speeches delivered by Horton B. Hetherington and L. P. D. Tilley on the evening of November 11th, 1899.

"To the best of our knowledge and of our conscience, Horton B. Hetherington has never attacked the Roman Catholic church of religion.

"Horton B. Hetherington has in no way whatever attacked the French Canadian race.

"Horton B. Hetherington did not say that the Liberal Conservative party proposed to make the next elections on questions of Protestant or Catholic religion.

"We are members of the club bearing the name of G. E. Foster, and in this club no religious questions are discussed. There is no anti-Catholic agitation.

"Handford A. Ryder.

"W. A. Fowlie.

"Anson B. Clark.

"Isaac B. Cromwell.

"David K. Beach.

"Arthur C. Beach.

"S. S. Chapman.

"Horatis A. Fowler.

Sworn before me, January 6th 1900.

"(Signed) Joseph S. Beach

THE HON. MR. FOSTER AND THE FRENCH CANADIANS.

Mr. Speaker, in this country ours, composite as it is and necessarily must be, the great lesson that cannot learn too soon is that, despite all the lines of difference which must necessarily mark people of different races and creeds and religions, arising from inherent constitutional reasons, from associations and environments acting for hundreds of years, the modes and habits of thought which have grown up essentially different on the principles on which they are founded amongst different civilisations and different nationalities

affidavit, signed by
which reads:—
assigned electors in
Brunswick, Queen's
ng sworn in declare

present at the meet-
the purpose of organ-
n, and have heard
by Horton B. Hether-
P. D. Tilley on the
ber 11th, 1899.
of our knowledge and
e, Horton B. Hether-
r attacked the Roman
of religion.
Hetherington has in no
attacked the French

Hetherington did not
Liberal Conservative
to make the next
questions of Protestant
igion.
members of the club bear
of G. E. Foster, and
religious questions at
ere is no anti-Catholi

"Handford A. Ryder.
"W. A. Fowlie.
"Anson B. Clark.
"Isaac B. Cromwell.
"David K. Beach.
"Arthur C. Beach.
"S. S. Chapman.
"Horatis A. Fowler.
ore me, January 6th

Joseph S. Beach

MR. FOSTER AND THE FRENCH CANADIANS.

er, in this country
site as it is and neces-
the great lesson that
n too soon is that,
lines of difference wh
sarily mark people of
es and creeds and
arising from in-
stitutional reasons, f
s and environme
hundreds of years,
habits of thought w
wn up essentially diffe
nciples on which they
amongst different civi
d different nationalit

aside from those rifts and differences
which must exist in this country to
a large extent, and which it is im-
possible to eradicate—I say that out-
side of those, it is a lesson that we
cannot learn too soon and inculcate
too widely, that we must be charit-
able to each other's point of view,
and endeavor to discover the excel-
lencies in each rather than the defi-
ciencies. Your Englishman, Irishman
and Scotchman—each has his faults.
And so has your Frenchman. But
every nationality has its excellencies,
and we would have a hard time get-
ting along in the world if we were
simply to look at the faults and ex-
aggerate them, and not give due
credit to the excellencies.

It is impossible absolutely to pre-
vent in political life some little coin-
ing to the surface of this friction of
race and creed in this country. But
if Ministers of the Crown drag in
these causes of friction by the heels
at every opportunity and accentuate
them, if from their high and leading
position they inflame those prejudices,
what is to become of the unity of
this country, and the harmony be-
tween its two dominant races? I am
not here as sponsor for the French
people, but I believe that this is ab-
solutely true, that if you were to
take the vote of the French people in

this country to-day, if you were to
give them the absolute and speedy
choice of transferring themselves to a
colonial position under the colonial
administration of France as it is to-
day, or remain as they are now,
there is not an intelligent Frenchman
in the Dominion who would make the
transfer.

I think that is a statement which
cannot be controverted. I believe
that is a truth upon which we can
build up a people in a fair and good
working union. I believe it is some-
thing which stands like the ages and
will always stand. Before I came to
this Parliament I had very little com-
merce with French-Canadians of any
class. But since I have come to this
Parliament I have become acquainted
with the French people, I have ming-
led with them as colleagues and hon-
ourable opponents, and I know them
better and appreciate them more than
when I knew comparatively nothing
of them. All the attrition of com-
merce, social intercourse and politi-
cal intercourse, superadded to that
principle I spoke of before, will make
of us, not a people who will all have
the same language and religion, but
a people of two languages and orig-
ins, each, however, good citizens and
vieing with each other in furthering
the progress of the country.